

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/788,485 | 03/01/2004 | Akihisa Shouen | 826.1933 | 7539 |
| 21171 7550 04/28/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| SUITE 700 | | | HSU, JONI | |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ··· Ioilli (G) | 11, 50 2000 | | 2628 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/28/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Notice of Abandonment | 10/788,485 | SHOUEN, AKIHISA | |
| Notice of Abandonment | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | JONI HSU | 2628 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | |

| JON 1130 2020 |
|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address |
| This application is abandoned in view of: |
| I. ☑ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 11 January 2008. (a) ☐ A reply was received on(with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time ofmonth(s)) which expired on (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114). |
| (c) ☐ A reply was received onbut it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below). |
| (d) ☑ No reply has been received. |
| Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). |
| (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission date), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice Allowance (PTOL-85). |
| (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due. |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$ |
| (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received. |
| 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37). |
| (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply. |
| (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received. |
| 1. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants. |
| The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. |
| 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims. |
| 7. ☑ The reason(s) below: |
| A telephone call was made to J. Randall Beckers on February 17, 2009, and it was confirmed that this case is abandoned. |
| /Kee M Tung/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628 |
| Delitions to review under 27 CED 1.127(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of chandenment under 27 CED 1.121 about the promotive filed to |

minimize any negative effects on patent term.
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-1432 (Rev. 04-01)